Ref #	Hits	Search Query	DBs	Default Operator	Plurals	Time Stamp
L2	0	@ad<"20010305" and @pd>"20050208" and 345/649.ccls.	USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	OR	ON	2005/03/25 15:49
L4	0	@ad<"20010305" and @pd>"20050208" and 715/863.ccls.	USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	OR	ON	2005/03/25 16:00

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/960,580	KANEKO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ted T. Vo	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 11/05/04 responsive to the Office action dated, 08/04/04.

- Claim 15 is currently amended.

Within this detailed action,

- Claims 1-39 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robinson et al., "New Approaches to Creating and Testing Internationalized Software".

- Claims 1-39 remain pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants' arguments to Claim 1-39 have been fully considered.

As noted in the prior Office Action that the limitation of Claims 15-28 (Article of Manufacturing) are corresponding to the method of Claims 1-14, and Claims 29-39 (system) are corresponding to the method of Claims 1, and 5-14.

a. Starting the arguments with Claim 29, where the arguments' features in Claim 29 are emphasized by underscoring (remarks page 10), Applicants are pointing out (Remarks: page 11, lines 5-10),

> "Robinson (page 32) describes Solution 1 "to construct artificial message strings that mimic the kind of problems we see in real translated message strings". For example, "using a string freeware Internet Utility called Encheferizer, we append long nonsense strings onto each English string" (page 32, left column, Robinson), and "to simulate double-byte characters such as those use in Japanese, we use a small program that maps ASCII characters into a double-byte format" (page 32, right column, Robinson)"

and Applicants argue that Robinson does not show how the programs to "*construct artificial message strings*", such as Encheferizer, are arranged with respect to the build application; Applicants argue

Robinson does not show "at least one executable pseudo utility application, stored in the memory of the computer system, and integrated with the build application to generate a pseudo-language, language specific build" (Remarks: page 11, lines 10-15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. It should be noted that the prefix "pseudo" has its meaning as "False", "apparently similar" from Greek: "pseudes": false.

Pseudo-localization is known as a technique that lets to modify text in a way that helps to find areas of concern when localizing international language application.

"Pseudolocalizer" is known as **testing of internationalized applications**. As given in the title of this reference, Robinson discloses **New Approaches to Creating and Testing Internationalized Software** (Pseudo-localization). Also, in the Applicants' cited passage from Robison above, "Our solution is to construct artificial-message strings that **mimic** the kinds of problems we see in the real translated message string", it is clear that Robinson' refers "**pseudo localization**".

By citing Robinson' statement, "Our solution is to construct artificial-message strings that mimic the kinds of problems, Applicants argue that Robinson does not show how the programs to construct artificial message strings". Examiner disagrees. See Robinson mentioning, "**result** is shown in Figure 3" (See last line in the left column of page 32), "Result" provides "means or how to" construct artificial-message strings. Figure 3 shows "result" which is provided by a program, physically mechanism, a utility, stored in the computer, and the Figure is shown when the program, the physically mechanism, or the utility, is run.

Furthermore, Applicants argue Robinson does not show "at least one executable pseudo utility application, stored in the memory of the computer system, Examiner disagrees. Figure 1 is cited as in the prior Office Action as referred to this feature. Refer to Figure 1; it is a typical executable pseudo utility application (See "A typical Application help menu"). An program application is stored in the computer is executed to give Figure 1 and other Figures appeared in the reference. This application is clearly **integrated** within the process flow (Figure 2) and as specified with Challenges 1-4, and Solutions 1-4 through out in Robinson's reference.

b. Regarding Applicants' arguments of Claim 15 that Robinson does not show how the programs to "construct artificial-message strings" and that Robinson does not show a machine-readable medium including instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by the machine to: implement a pseudo localization process integrated with a build process (Remarks: page 12, lines 8-12).

Examiner respectfully responds: The arguments repeat the features what argued with Claim 29 and already responded by Examiner above. It is noted that Claim 1, Claim 15, and Claim 29 have the same functionality.

c. Regarding Applicants' arguments of Claim 1 that Robinson does not show how the programs to "construct artificial-message strings" and that Robinson does not show integrating a pseudo localization process with a build process (Remarks: Page 13, lines 3-5).

Examiner respectfully responds: The arguments repeat the features what argued with Claim 29. See the Examiner' rationale addressed to Claim 29 above.

d. Regarding Applicants' arguments of the dependent Claim 5 of Claim 1 that Robinson Figure 6 and Figure 7 does not correspond to the limitation 5 (Remarks: page 13)

Examiner respectfully disagrees: Claim 5 recites a feature that is corresponding to the **standard code known as UI code**, where this code extends string/structure given to ASCII code to provide more international characters (prefix string added). The ASCII causes only Standard English alphabets to be viewed. These other languages, such as Japanese, Chinese, Hebrew, require an extension of ASCII code (Unicode). The Figure 6 or Figure 7 shows that Robison includes language-specific fonts built for the languages such as French, Japan/Chinese, etc., supported by the standard UI. By contrast, Applicants only point out the passages written by Robinson in page 34 referring to Figure 6 and 7 (Remarks page 13, started at line 16 to lines 1-2 in page 14), and these passages are irrelevant to the non-English alphabets, **which use a particular font.** It should be noted that the non-English alphabets use standard UI code other than the standard ASCII code. The showing of the non-English alphabets in **Figures 6 and 7,** further in **Figure 9,** and Robinson discussion of **the Team** (page 31, left column) about

the non-English alphabet languages such as **German, Swedish, Korean, Chinese, etc.**, correspond to the limitation 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robinson et al., "New Approaches to Creating and Testing Internationalized Software", 11-1998.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification.

As per Claim 1: Robinson discloses: "*A method, comprising:*

integrating a pseudo localization process with a build process, wherein the pseudo localization process includes at least one pseudo localization utility application (See Page 31, Figure 2; see page 30, Figure 1, "English", "French": *at least one pseudo localization utility application*);

executing the at least one pseudo localization utility application to generate pseudo-translated locale-dependant code, wherein executing the at least one pseudo localization utility application includes:

(a) retrieving locale-dependant code from at least one storage location (See Figure 1, Solution 1 inputted into Traditional Process Flow);

(b) altering an appearance of the locale-dependant code (See Figure 1, the box "Translate the Message Catalog into Multiple Languages", "Test I18N code Using Default Message Catalog": *locale-dependant code,* See Figures 4 and 5, pages 32 and 33, respectively: *altering an appearance;* see page 32, Solution 1)*; and*

(c) storing the altered locale-dependant code in at least one second storage location (See Figure 1, the box "Test I18N code Using Translated Message Catalog": *in at least one second storage location); and generating a pseudo-language build with the pseudo-translated locale-dependant code.*" (See Figure 5: *a pseudo-language build,* see page 32, Solution 1).

As per Claim 2: Robinson discloses: "*The method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

testing the pseudo-language build; and

identifying at least one internationalization bug." (See page 30, right column, Process Flow: indentations 2 and 3).

As per Claim 3: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 2, wherein the internationalization bug comprises a hard-coded string, a hard-coded format, or a hard-coded reference to a translation" (See page 33, left column, Challenge 2).

As per Claim 4: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 2, wherein identifying the at least one internationalization bug comprises discovering unaltered locale-dependant code in the user-interface" (See page 33, right column, Challenge 3, the last 3 steps).

As per Claim 5: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein altering the appearance of the locale-dependant code comprises adding at least one prefix character to the locale-dependant code" (See page 34, Figures 6 and 7: discussing a Japanese preceding string).

As per Claim 6: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 5, wherein the at least one prefix character comprises at least one multi-byte character" (See page 34, Figures 6 and 7: a Japanese character comprises at least one multi-byte character).

As per Claim 7: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 5, wherein the at least one prefix character comprises at least one right-to-left character" (See page 34: Solution 3: language independent test, target

language: Noted that a target language depends on its writing style: some target language having writing style from right to left).

As per Claim 8: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 5, wherein the at least one prefix character comprises a prefix string including at least one multi-byte character and at least one right-to-left character" (See rationale of Claim 7 and 8 above).

As per Claim 9: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one server message specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one server message" (See page 33, right column, Challenge 3, the last 3 steps, and referring to "test case").

As per Claim 10: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one repository string specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one repository string" (See page 30, Figure 1: "Help", "Aide").

As per Claim 11: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one resource file specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one resource file" (See page 30, Figure 1: "Help menu" in English and French).

As per Claim 12: Robinson discloses: "*The method of Claim 1, wherein the at least one pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one utility application* (Figures 8 and 9: HTML version) *capable of retrieving or altering at least one element of user-interface code of a type selected from a group, including; a server message, a repository string, a static UI file, and a seed data file*" (Discussed in Figure 2; and see Figures 7 and 8, buttons in English and Japanese characters).

As per Claim 13: Robinson discloses: "*The method of Claim 1, wherein the build process comprises a database build process* (Figure 2), *the at least One pseudo localization utility application comprises at least one seed data file specific utility, and the locale-dependant code comprises at least one seed data file*" (See page 35, Figures 8 and 9: "HTML version of an English help page and HTML version of a Japanese Help page).

As per Claim 14: Robinson discloses: "The method of Claim 1, wherein the build process comprises a software build process" (Figure 2; and particularly, page 30: "Developing Internationalized Software").

As per Claims 15-28: See rationale respectively of Claims 1 to 14 above,

As per Claims 29-39: See rationale respectively of Claim 1, 5-14 above.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3694. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR System, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ted T. Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2192
April 01, 2005